

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,657	SUDO, HIROAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NINOS DONABED	2444	

All Participants:

(1) NINOS DONABED

(2) _____

Date of Interview: 1 June 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Final dated 5/7/2010

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

All

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/N. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Status of Application: allowance

(3) Douq Agopsowicz 56792

(4) _____

Time: Noon

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's Attorney to further the case along. Examiner asked the Attorney if adding the word "wherein" to "the predetermined cells" of claims 9 and 12. the Attorney agreed to the change. Secondly examiner asked if the phrase "and that is adjacent to the first mobility anchor point across a boundary with the first mobility anchor point" in claims 9 and 12 could be clarified to read "and wherein the second mobility anchor point is adjacent to the first mobility anchor point separated by a boundary with the first mobility anchor point"